PEARSON, J.

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION

RONALD A. NAPIER,	)
Plaintiff,	) CASE NO. 4:13CV2433
	) JUDGE BENITA Y. PEARSON
V.	)
D. BOBBY, Warden, et al.,	) <u>MEMORANDUM OF OPINION</u>
Defendants.	) <u>AND ORDER</u> ) [Resolving <u>ECF No. 22</u> ]

Pro Se Plaintiff Ronald A. Napier filed this action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 against Ohio State Penitentiary ("OSP") Warden D. Bobby, and OSP Corrections Officer Dale Knowles.

Plaintiff's claims against Warden Bobby were dismissed with prejudice pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(e). See Memorandum of Opinion and Order (ECF No. 9).

On September 2, 2014, the case was referred by the undersigned to Magistrate Judge George J. Limbert for general pretrial supervision pursuant to <u>28 U.S.C.</u> § 636 and <u>Local Rules</u> <u>72.1 and 72.2(a)</u>, which authorized him to file with the Court a report containing proposed findings and a recommendation for disposition of case-dispositive motions. *See* Order of Reference (ECF No. 10).

After Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief (ECF No. 22) was filed and served, the Magistrate Judge submitted an Interim Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 27) recommending that the Court deny the Plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief. *Id.* at PageID #: 348.

(4:13CV2433)

Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2) provides that objections to a report and recommendation must be filed within 14 days after service. Objections to the Magistrate Judge's Report were, therefore, due on April 20, 2015. Neither party has filed objections, evidencing satisfaction with the Magistrate Judge's recommendation. Any further review by the Court would be a duplicative and inefficient use of the Court's limited resources. *Thomas v. Arn*, 728 F.2d 813 (6th Cir. 1984), *aff'd*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Howard v. Secretary of Health and Human Services*, 932 F.2d 505 (6th Cir. 1991); *United States v. Walters*, 638 F.2d 947, 949-50 (6th Cir. 1981).

Accordingly, the Interim Report and Recommendation (<u>ECF No. 27</u>) is hereby adopted. Plaintiff's Motion for Injunctive Relief (<u>ECF No. 22</u>) is denied.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Under <u>Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(d)</u>, three days must be added to the fourteen-day time period because the Magistrate Judge's Report was served upon Plaintiff by regular U.S. mail, and counsel for Corrections Officer Knowles was served by operation of the Court's electronic filing system. *See* <u>Electronic Filing Policies and Procedures Manual (July 26, 2011) at 6.</u>